



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/643,992	08/20/2003	Masahiko Monzen	1035-464	5149
23117	7590	04/05/2005		
NIXON & VANDERHYE, PC 1100 N GLEBE ROAD 8TH FLOOR ARLINGTON, VA 22201-4714			EXAMINER DUONG, THOI V	
			ART UNIT 2871	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 04/05/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/643,992	Applicant(s) MONZEN, MASAHIKO	
	Examiner Thoi V. Duong	Art Unit 2871	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 December 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 ~~is/are~~ pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 9 and 10 ~~is/are~~ withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 ~~is/are~~ rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>0803</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election without traverse of claims 1-8 in the reply filed on December 29, 2004 is acknowledged.

Accordingly, claims 9 and 10 are withdrawn and claims 1-8 are considered in this office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-3 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by JP 2000-312070 (JP'070).

Re claims 1 and 8, as shown in Fig. 2, JP'070 discloses a liquid crystal display module comprising a flexible substrate 2a, wherein the flexible substrate 2a includes:

a plurality of terminal blocks (G1, G2), each of which has a plurality of electrode terminals 20,

the plurality of terminal blocks including a first terminal block G1 and a second terminal blocks G2 having different terminal pitches (Abstract and paragraph 21).

As to the product-by-process limitation "a post-thermal-compression-bonding elongation compensation amount being set for each terminal block in accordance with the terminal pitch thereof, it has been recognized that "Even through product-by-process

Art Unit: 2871

claims are limited by and defined by the process, determination of patentability is based on the product itself. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior art product was made by a different process". *In re Thorpe*, 227 USPQ 964,966 (Fed. Cir. 1985). See also MPEP 2113.

Re claim 2, JP'070 discloses that, per terminal block, due to changing the pitch between terminal electrodes, a line width and a space width of the terminal electrodes are so set as to absorb accumulated elongation and misalignment caused by the thermal compression bonding (paragraph 21).

Re claim 3, the first terminal block G1 has a terminal pitch smaller than a terminal pitch of the second terminal block G2 since the first terminal block G1 is away from the center section of the flexible substrate (paragraph 21);

a ratio of the line width over the terminal pitch, of the second terminal block is smaller than a ratio of the line width over the terminal pitch, of the first terminal block since the line width is the same in both first and second terminal blocks G1 and G2.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 4-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 2000-312070 (JP'070) in view of Chung et al. (Chung, USPN 6,583,845 B1).

JP'070 discloses a flexible substrate that is basically the same as that recited in claims 4-7 except for a dummy terminal block in non-formation areas in which the electrode terminals are not provided.

Re claim 4, as shown in Fig. 6, Chung discloses a flexible substrate 42 (base film TCP) comprising:

a dummy terminal block 50 in non-formation areas in which the electrode terminals of the terminal block 46 are not provided, the dummy terminal block 50 having a plurality of dummy electrode terminals,

wherein, re claim 5, the dummy electrode terminals of the dummy terminal block 50 are identical with the electrode terminals of the terminal block 46 (col. 2, lines 12-28);

wherein, re claim 6, the dummy electrode terminals of the dummy terminal block 50 have the same terminal pitch as the electrode terminals of the terminal block 46 (col. 2, lines 12-28).

Re claim 7, as shown in Fig. 6, the flexible substrate of Chung comprises:

a dummy terminal block 50 in a non-formation area in which the electrode terminals of the terminal block 46 are not provided, the dummy terminal block 50 including a plurality of dummy electrode terminals having the same terminal pitch as the terminal block 46 (col. 2, lines 12-28).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the flexible substrate of JP'070 with the teaching

Art Unit: 2871

of Chung by forming a dummy terminal block in non-formation areas in which the electrode terminals are not provided so as to increase the bonding force between the flexible substrate and the liquid crystal panel (col. 2, lines 17-20).

Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thoi V. Duong whose telephone number is (571) 272-2292. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:30 am to 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Kim, can be reached at (571) 272-2293.

Thoi Duong



03/25/2005



TARIFUR R. CHOWDHURY
PRIMARY EXAMINER